

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed August 4, 2009. At the time of the Final Office Action, Claims 4-12 were pending in this Application. Claims 4-12 were rejected. Claims 1-3 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 4, 7, and 10 are amended herein. New Claims 13-18 are added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 4-12 stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,014,135 issued to Antonio M. Fernandes (“*Fernandes*”). Applicant respectfully traverses and submits the cited art does not teach all of the elements of the claimed embodiment of the invention.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, “the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co. Ltd.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant respectfully submits that *Fernandes* cannot anticipate the rejected Claims as amended, because *Fernandes* does not show all the elements of the amended Claims. For example, *Fernandes* fails to teach at least the following features of amended independent Claim 4:

generating an assembled display combining at least a portion of a display belonging to the object computer and at least a portion of a display belonging to the processing computer,

activating at the object computer a local file processing function on the processing computer, and

generating an object processing platform by moving an object from the portion of the assembled display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of the portion of the assembled display belonging to the processing computer

Specifically, *Fernandes* fails to teach generating an assembled display that combines an object computer display with a processing computer display. *Fernandes* merely discloses a typical network of computers where the display devices of the various computers provide separate displays. For example, the portions of *Fernandes* cited by the Examiner teach a system for dragging a document icon displayed on a first computer's display to a recipient icon also displayed on the first computer's display, which causes the document to be routed to a second computer and the document icon to be displayed on the second computer's display. The first and second computers' respective displays are completely separate -- they are not combined in any way to generate an assembled display. Thus, *Fernandes* fails to teach "generating an assembled display combining at least a portion of a display belonging to the object computer and at least a portion of a display belonging to the processing computer," as recited in amended Claim 4.

Further, because *Fernandes* does not teach generating an assembled display that combines the displays of two devices, *Fernandes* also cannot teach "generating an object processing platform by moving an object from the portion of the assembled display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of the portion of the assembled display belonging to the processing computer."

For at least these reasons, amended Claim 4 is allowable over *Fernandes*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of amended Claim 4, as well as Claims 5–6 and 13–14 that depend from Claim 4.

Similarly, amended independent Claims 7 and 10 recite "an assembled display combining at least a portion of a display belonging to the object computer and at least a portion of a display belonging to the processing computer" and "wherein the object processing platform is generated by moving an object from the portion of the assembled display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of the portion of the assembled display belonging to the processing computer." *Fernandes* fails to teach these limitations for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended Claim 4. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of amended Claims 7 and 10, as well as Claims 8–9, 11–12, and 15–18 that depend therefrom.

New Claims 13-18 are Allowable.

New dependent Claims 13-18 are allowable because they depend from independent Claims 4, 7, and 10 shown above to be allowable, and further because they include additional limitations not taught by *Fernandes*. For example, new Claims 13, 15, and 17 recite:

the object computer is configured to generate a local object computer graphical user interface (GUI);

the processing computer is configured to generate a local processing computer GUI; and

as a result of generating the assembled display, at least a portion of the local object computer GUI is displayed on the display belonging to the processing computer.

Fernandes does not teach generating an assembled display where “at least a portion of the local object computer GUI is displayed on the display belonging to the processing computer.”

As another example, new Claims 14, 16, and 18 recite “

wherein moving the object from the portion of the assembled display belonging to the object computer to the interaction area of the portion of the assembled display belonging to the processing computer automatically causes the display belonging to the processing computer to switch from displaying the at least a portion of the local object computer GUI to displaying the local processing computer GUI.

Fernandes does not teach causing a processing computer display to switch from displaying at least a portion of a GUI of another computer (the object computer) to displaying a local GUI of the processing computer, much less where such display switch is triggered by moving an object from an assembled display portion shown on an object computer display to an interaction area of an assembled display portion shown on a processing computer display.

For at least these reasons, new dependent Claims 13-18 are allowable over *Fernandes*.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the remarks set forth above. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims.

Applicant believes there are no other fees due at this time, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4871 of King & Spalding LLP.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicant's attorney at 512.457.2030.

Respectfully submitted,
KING & SPALDING LLP
Attorney for Applicant

Emrell

Eric M. Grabski
Reg. No. 51,749

Date: September 17, 2009

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:
KING & SPALDING LLP
CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **86528**
512.457.2030
512.457.2100 (fax)